

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe I ought to advise my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] has a substitute which he proposes to offer to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I heard about it. Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wished to be sure that under the rule pertaining to amendments in the third degree the Senator's amendment would not be out of order when he offers it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The amendment would be in order under the present parliamentary situation.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, notwithstanding the rule of germaneness, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LETTER FROM WIFE OF SERVICE-MAN IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Senators always like to receive letters from their constituents. It helps us in our endeavors to be good public servants, to have the benefit of the views and advice of the people whom we represent. During the more than 5 years that I have been privileged to be a Member of this body, I have received very few letters from citizens that have so impressed me as did a letter which I received today and to which I shall advert and ask to have printed in the Record. I feel that the American people are entitled to know the truth regarding South Vietnam and what we are doing there. It appears to me that this letter makes a real contribution to that subject. It begins as follows:

Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was warned not to write this letter if I valued my husband's career. I do know that military careers have been ruined by letters from wives. I do not understand how this happens, whether the Senator has taken offense, or whether he has turned over the letter to someone else who has taken action. Whatever the reason, or however it happens, I think it is deplorable and should not be allowed in a democratic government. At any rate, I could not believe that you, sir, would permit such a thing. I have the utmost confidence in your integrity, otherwise I certainly should not write. But I am sure you would receive more letters from military families if they could be assured that it would not endanger their careers.

Mr. President, it will be noted that I have in my hand the letter in its entirety, but I have deleted the name of the lady, who is a university graduate from my State.

I have no personal complaints at all. I am living in Saigon. I came here at my own expense and I am living at my own expense while my husband is stationed—

And she tells his rank and where he is stationed. The letter continues:

We both agreed on a year's assignment in Vietnam. So my husband volunteered to come here. This was our way of "paying

rent," as Mr. GOLDWATER would put it, for our place in the world. Although I cannot live here with my husband, I came to be near him, to see him occasionally, and to give him moral support.

Then she tells where their years of married life were spent, part of the time being in my State of Ohio.

So every minute together counts a great deal to us; we are so anxious to have a home and a normal married life. It was a sacrifice for us to come here, one we were willing to make. But now that we are here, we feel our sacrifice was in vain, because we are losing the war. And that, sir, is my complaint. We are losing because we are not winning, and I want to know "Why not victory?"

A big problem here is that most of the Vietnamese do not really care about the war; most of them do not want to fight. Under the circumstances this is understandable. There are numerous families in Vietnam without homes, without food, and without a job. Even in Saigon there are people sleeping in doorways and on the sidewalks, and begging for food. These people have no purpose in life. They do not understand communism and have no means to resist it even if they understood.

There are Vietnamese guards at the American installations here. When these places are bombed by the Vietcong, some of the guards are bribed, some run away. Yet we do not put American guards at all the posts because, according to rumor, this would look as though we didn't trust the Vietnamese guards. There may be a more logical reason, but I can think of no reason at all. In fact, at most of the big bombings in Saigon, there has been a noticeable lack of any Vietnamese around these places. It seems very likely that they have been warned beforehand.

In combat, when the Vietnamese do have a chance to fire on the Vietcong, quite often they refuse. These people are tired of war. They have no fight left in them. Even if they were receiving adequate training to fight the war by themselves (which they are not), they could not and would not win by themselves, because they have no will to win.

There are strong neutralist tendencies here, and much talk of a coup, which, if successful, will be the end of southeast Asia, and all the Americans will have died in vain. I am very impressed with General Khanh; he seems to be trying very diligently and has certainly taken some steps in the right direction—although who can actually be sure of anyone? Assuming, however, that he means what he says and is not another wolf in sheep's clothing, such as Ho Chi Minh, I don't think that even his leadership can win the war or convince these people to fight, especially if the Americans go home. When the Americans go, the Communists will take over—it's that simple. It should be more than obvious that if this war is won, it will have to be won by the Americans.

Even the Americans cannot win by the methods we are using at present. Unless we do something positive very soon, the war will be at the same stage in 1965 when, supposedly, our troops are to be withdrawn. And if it is at the same stage then as now, much better would it be to withdraw our troops today while we can still save some American lives. We are making no great gains, but merely holding our own—and just barely that. But when we pull out the plugs, communism will flood this area. But if our intention is merely to delay the flood and not prevent it, I can see no logic to our purpose.

It should not be a question of whether or not we have the right to get involved in a war that is not our own. In the first place, it is our war. Any fight against communism

is our own. But we are pretending that we are not fighting. According to Mr. McNamara, "We are only assisting them through training and logistical support." In the same statement he says that "101 Americans have been killed in combat in Vietnam." Is this not contradictory? How is one killed in combat if he is involved only in training?

She goes on to tell about the loss of life in her husband's outfit, and the letter continues as follows:

These 101 lives lost, which Mr. McNamara lists, of course do not include the Americans who have been killed in Saigon by Vietcong bombs. I suppose these lives are not to be counted, because these Americans were murdered—not killed in combat. It used to be that the United States would avenge one American life lost. How many lives must be lost today before we retaliate? Have we no backbone any more? We are like a child who draws a chalk line on the sidewalk and says to the town bully, "If you step over this line I will bloody your nose." The bully steps over and the cowardly child steps back, draws another line, and says, "I was kidding about the first line, but if you step over this line I will bloody your nose." How many lives are we going to lose before we stop retreating? Why do not we admit that we are actively participating in this war and really fight for our cause? God knows we have enough reason.

I cannot understand Mr. McNamara's reasoning for anything he says. I get the impression that he must be taken on a "guided tour" when he comes here, and that he sees only what certain people want him to see, and listens to what they want him to hear—which leads me to another thing which, to me, does not seem right. There are some people who are profiting from this war. I have never seen so many colonels and generals in one place in all my life. They are living here, at Government expense, in beautiful villas with two or three servants per household. I have talked to some wives who do not even want to go home because they could not afford such luxuries at home. Not that they should not have nice quarters, but it seems to me that their values are a little misplaced.

These men—

The generals and the colonels—

live here under ideal conditions and gain combat experience, which will look good on their records. I know of one colonel who goes to Bien Hoa every Sunday to fly a combat mission. Please tell me what enemy action occurs so regularly that he can make an appointment to fly a combat mission. No doubt he will make his goal of 100 fights before he goes home, probably with never a shot fired by him or at him. But he will go home with a combat ribbon.

It may be necessary to have so many high-ranking men here; they may have a purpose. But I don't understand what it is, and I can't find out. The command seems awfully topheavy, and I can't really believe that these are the men who are doing the fighting. In fact, they have become the laughing stock of Saigon. Even the nightly entertainment in my hotel sings this song:

"Oh, dear! What can the matter be?  
Eighteen generals and no strategy!"

If I may digress from the letter for a moment, we now have the situation of Secretary McNamara making another trip to South Vietnam. It is a fine thing that he is going to make that trip. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I listened to the testimony of generals who had made trips to South Vietnam. They told us about the compounds they were erecting at different

places so that when the Vietcong attacked, more Vietcongese would be killed than the South Vietnamese would suffer in casualties.

I have never been more than a civilian in uniform, but at the time when they said we were winning the war in South Vietnam, the thought occurred to me, "How can we win the war in South Vietnam when they sit there in compounds and wait for the enemy?" Napoleon would be surprised to hear of that kind of strategy. How can we win by 1965? How can we ascertain the truth when the generals and the Secretary of Defense and his entourage go to South Vietnam on a sort of guided tour, visit the ambassador, are entertained at receptions and cocktail parties, and have conferences with the present rulers of South Vietnam? Why do they not go out in the field and talk with some privates, sergeants, lieutenants, and captains? They are the knowledgeable ones. They are the ones who fight and die in combat. Why do they not come back after doing so and report the truth to the American people?

I am glad to read this very informative and extremely thoughtful letter today. I shall hasten on:

The song goes on, and there are many more. But they are not very flattering to the prestige of our country.

One of the biggest battles over here is going on between the U.S. Army and Air Force. Each seems determined to oust the other and be the sole performer. I, myself, know very little about counter-guerrilla tactics, and I cannot say which, if either, alone, can handle the job more effectively. But I do know that a lot of money is going down the drain because of duplication, and a lot of lives are being lost because of the lack of cooperation. There is duplication in other units over here, such as Intelligence, which I have heard about (not from my husband), and probably many more. I seems to me this should be investigated. A certain amount of rivalry is usually good, but when the cause is a common cause, and such a great cause, I can see no place for it.

Sir, if this were all my opinion alone, I would not burden you with such a lengthy letter. But it is the opinion of many who want to know what is going on, many who should know what is going on. It is the opinion of many who disagree with communism, who want to stop it, who want to push it back. It is the opinion of many who want to be proud of their country, who want to believe in it, and who are willing to die for its cause. It is the opinion of everyone I know. It should be the opinion of every American.

I regret that I have no specific solutions to suggest to these problems. I do, however, have some general ideas which possibly may be worked out by someone with more experience and authority than I. I should like to list them for you:

Before I list these suggestions and then close, I wish to state that I am today asking the Secretary of Defense for a report as to how many generals and how many colonels we have in South Vietnam, how long they have been there, and how many members of their families are living with them.

There are supposed to be approximately 15,000 men acting as instructors in South Vietnam. I cannot understand having 18 generals for 15,000 men, if this is in fact the case. They probably

have traffic police over there, directing traffic so that the generals and colonels do not run into each other on dark nights—that is, if they are away from their lush villas on dark nights.

Her five suggestions are:

1. That we accept the fact that the Vietnamese alone cannot win this war.

2. That the Americans commit themselves, and openly and forcefully engage in this war.

3. That we have strong leadership in guerrilla warfare, bring in more troops as required, and take the war into North Vietnam if necessary.

4. That the people who have no real purpose here be weeded out and sent home.

That is a suggestion which I believe could well be made to the Secretary of Defense.

5. That we do away with duplication and replace it with efficiency and cooperation.

These are the five suggestions made by this fine lady who writes so thoughtful and informative a letter that I feel it should be placed in the RECORD in order that Americans may know the facts, as she sees them.

She adds:

If we cannot accomplish these things, then I recommend a sixth: that we get out of Vietnam.

Although I realize that you are very busy, I should certainly appreciate your views on the subject; and I should like to know what, if anything, is being done. Since letters do not always reach their destination through Vietnamese mail, and since I have no permanent address (I am wandering from friend to friend), I am sending this through U.S. mail with my husband's APO address (shown below). If you reply, it would be well to use his address.

I sincerely appreciate the time you have spent in reading my letter. I consider it a privilege to be able to voice my opinion.

Yours very sincerely,

Mr. President, I feel, in times such as these, in the grim cold war period, that the American people are entitled to know all the facts about South Vietnam and from South Vietnam, that they are entitled to know everything—except such matters, of course, as might be helpful to our Communist enemies.

I feel that a letter of this sort is a distinct contribution to furnishing much-needed knowledge and information about South Vietnam today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
GORDON ALLOTT,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
WALTER ROGERS,  
JAMES A. HALEY,  
JOHN P. SAYLOR,  
JACK WESTLAND,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its disagreement to the House amendments and ask a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

#### NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE NOT TO TELEVISION ITS GAMES ON FRIDAY NIGHTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the commissioner of the National Football League, Pete Rozelle, showed fine statesmanship in announcing last night that the National Football League would not televise any professional football games on Friday nights, as many college and high school football teams feared would be the case. During the course of the hearings on professional sports antitrust legislation, S. 2391, Commissioner Rozelle appeared as one of the witnesses and was asked about the published reports that some of the National League football games would be televised on Friday nights, and that the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the various State high school athletic associations had registered strong protests to such action because it would interfere with many high school and college football games that were played on Friday nights. Mr. Rozelle stated that the National Football League was studying the possibilities of Friday night television. At that time, Walter Byers, executive director, National Collegiate Athletic Association, sent me a telegram protesting such televising of Friday night professional football games, and noted that the high schools had joined in such protests. Both the telegram of NCAA and the high school associations were inserted in the